REFLECTIONS ON Mr. LINDSEY's APOLOGY.

[Price One Shilling and Six-pence.]

BRITISH MUSEUM

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE Author *drew up these* Reflections *for his own profit, proposing to give* Mr. Lindsey's Apology *a fair and candid examination, and to receive truth wherever he found it.—He would not have presumed to publish on the occasion, if he had been apprized of any abler Advocate undertaking the cause; but after waiting some time, and hearing of no answer, at least before this was sent to the Press (owing to his distance from the* Metropolis); *he thought it was a pity, to let the affair continue disregarded; and that a middling defence might be better than total silence, which would have been an implicit submission. — Such as this is, the Author commits it to the blessing of God, and the favourable perusal of those Readers, that know how to make allowances.*

REFLECTIONS

ON THE

APOLOGY

OF THE

Rev. THEOPHILUS LINDSEY, *M.A.*

Late Vicar of

CATTERICK, in *YORKSHIRE.*

" Another may ſuggeſt arguments and motives to pre-
" vail upon us to relinquiſh ſentiments, that he ſees
" to be erroneous and dangerous; and to embrace
" his own. And to do this is oftentimes a duty for
" ſome perſons, and a part of chriſtian charity in
" all. — *Mr. Lindſey's Sermon at the opening of the*
" *Chapel, in Eſſex-Houſe,* page 7."

Sold by J. Buckland, in *Pater-Noſter-Row*; W. Harris, in *St. Paul's-Church-Yard*; and G. Keith, in *Grace-Church-Street*, London, 1774.

BRITISH MUSEUM

REFLECTIONS, &c.

UNdoubtedly every man is at liberty to declare his ſentiments to the world; nor ought any one to dictate to another, the title he ſhould give to his lucubrations; but I was rather ſurpriſed, on the report of Mr. Lindſey's reſignation, to hear of an *Apology* for his conduct herein.—Had the book been entitled *Reaſons for the Reſignation*, &c. I ſhould not have wondered; for I muſt naturally ſuppoſe that no man would do ſo, without ſome reaſon—ſome weighty reaſon.—I had heard indeed of *An Apology for the life of Colley Cibber, player*; and *An Apology for the life of Conſtantia Phillips*;—and thought there was enough in the life of each to apologize for: but an Apology for *reſigning a valuable living*, ſeemed to me altogether ſuperfluous, and the term unſuitable.—Would Mr. Lindſey apologize to the world?—The world may admire at a diſtance, but is not a party concerned.—Would Mr. Lindſey apologize to his ſucceſſor?—I preſume he will readily excuſe it.—But would Mr. Lindſey apologize to his former pariſhioners?—If this were admitted, I doubt it would prove too much: I mean, that if

an apology to *them* was neceſſary, it would have been as poſſible, to raiſe a *reformed unitarian-church* at *Catterick* in *Yorkſhire*, as *Eſſex Street* in the *Strand*, *London*; and that, upon Mr. Lindſey's own principles and profeſſions, it was at leaſt his duty, to have attempted it. —It may perhaps, be thought impertinent in me, to take notice of this circumſtance; but the Rev. Apologiſt himſelf led me to it, by a ſuggeſtion or two of his own, p. 223. viz. "that an attempt of this nature, would "have created confuſion, *without any adequate* "*religious improvement or edification.*"—Unhappily, this is a conceſſion that contradicts the whole tenor of his writings, in which he repreſents the notions he ſtands up for, as of the higheſt nature.—And equally inſufficient is another ſuſpicion, hinted probably with a view of obviating this remark, viz. "*that the peo-*"*ple*, when he was removed from his work, "*would probably return to their old forms again*;" an argument that might be as ſtrongly urged againſt all attempts to reformation whatſoever; and which happens to have the ſaying of Gamaliel directly againſt it, Acts v. 39. *If this work be of God, men cannot overthrow it.*—If then an *Apology* to his pariſhioners was at all neceſſary, ſome attempt of this nature, does not appear to be *totally unneceſſary*.

But very poſſibly it was not neceſſary; and the *word* is not material.—I mean not to put any

any forced conſtruction, on the Rev. Gentleman's proceedings.—He could not conſciouſly continue, in his conformity to the eſtabliſhed-worſhip.—The ſacrifice he has made to conſcience therefore, was right, was proper, was noble, and will have but few imitators; yet I cannot ſay that I greatly like, what the world calls *puffing*.—In what heroic characters is Mr. Lindſey ſet forth in news-papers and reviews! "But for theſe he is not anſwerable: "every writer has acceſs to the news-papers; "and the reviewers are ever willing to make "the world believe, that the balance of piety "and good ſenſe is on the *unitarian* ſide of the "queſtion"—granted.—But how much do the writings of Mr. Lindſey *himſelf* ſet off their Author! How frequent the indirect encomiums at leaſt, on his ſteadineſs in that which he judged to be the cauſe of truth!—"In "leaving a ſtation of eaſe and affluence, in "which he hoped to have ended his days. "—Leaving it with no proſpect of preferment, but the contrary; to combat with "various ſhifts and hardſhips of an uncertain "world: (a)—*He laboured, and others are entered into his labours*:"—This reſignation is frequently held forth to us, as a public declaration of an adherence, to a fundamental

 principle

(a) Farewell addreſs to the pariſhioners of Catterick, page 1, 12.

principle in true religion, the belief of *one God*; a doctrine which, it seems, heathens and heatheniſh, i. e. *trinitarian*, *(b)* chriſtians deny. —It is ſet forth as a public proteſt againſt an error almoſt equivalent to infidelity. — It is even called, what I could never have *imagined* it, *a confeſſion of Chriſt before men*, *(c)* which the Rev. Author expects will entitle him to the approbation of his Judge in the great day.— "What does the Author *confeſs* of his Judge "aſked I, that will in the judgment, appear "ſo much to his advantage?" A moment's reflection anſwered, "he *denies* that ſupreme "honour and reſpect, which in the opinion of "other perſons, *at leaſt as pious*, *as ſenſible*, "*and as much concerned to know the truth as* "*himſelf*, the ſcriptures clearly aſcribe to this "Judge," for with no propriety, can this *denial* be called a *confeſſion* of Chriſt. — Mr. Lindſey quotes *The account of the ejected miniſters*, p. 208.—He very plainly wiſhes, to have his own caſe conſidered as ſimilar: Untaught and unthinking people may perhaps imagine, that they were all of his ſentiments, and his practice a cloſe imitation of theirs; but no two

(b) A trinity of divine perſons, which in their ordinary ſignification are confeſſed by all to imply three Gods, would paganize in ſome time the whole chriſtian church, which *is heathen already in the majority of it's members, by occaſion of theſe terms.* Apology, p. 197.

(c) Farewell addreſs, p. 12.

two caſes can be more different. — Theſe *ejected* miniſters, *all* of them, believed the doctrine of a *Trinity in the Godhead.*—Theſe miniſters, when ſilenced and ejected from the public exerciſe of their miniſtry, followed the example of their bleſſed Maſter; *they did not ſtrive, nor cry, nor did any hear their voice in the ſtreets,* Mat. xii. 19. — *When they were reviled, they reviled not again*; but all the contempt, obloquy, reproach and perſecution which wicked men could heap upon them, they endured, *quietly* and *patiently*; glad of every opportunity of doing good in a private manner; nor durſt they, amidſt all their difficulties, have forſaken the ſpot where formerly they had been made uſeful; leſt they ſhould have been guilty of "*abandoning the ſtations aſſigned* them *by pro-*"*vidence, and being found idle and unprofitable,* "*when the great Maſter came to call for the* "*account of the talent received.*" (Apology, p. 210.) *Behold, we count them bleſſed who endure.* James v. 11.

There is nothing more talked of, or leſs practiſed in our days than chriſtian-charity. Many have been the reflections on the party uſually ſtiled orthodox for their want of charity, and it often happens, that thoſe who reflect are as deſtitute of the principle, as thoſe they reflect on; their language is as bitter and provok-

provoking as any other whatſoever; *(d)* but of all the ſpecies of uncharitableneſs, that is the moſt diſagreeable, which is cloathed in ſmooth expreſſions, and carries with it the appearance of good-nature; a dreſs exceedingly well calculated, to caſt odium on the oppoſite ſentiments,

---

(d) "It was in an evil hour, ſays Mr. Lindſey, that "the word Hereſy was applied to matters of opinion, p. "21." But he himſelf *candidly* adopts a quotation from *Biſhop Clayton*, applying it to the orthodox, *there muſt be hereſies, that they which are approved may be manifeſt.* 1 Cor. xi. 19. i. e. "The Trinitarians are the wicked, and we the only ſtaunch Chriſtians." p. 179.—"*Publick* "*bodies of men are not chargeable* with the conduct of "private individuals, belonging to that body," ſays Mr. Lindſey, ſpeaking of the *Feathers Tavern*, p. 3; but the conduct of former ages is, in the Apology, frequently inſinuated to the reproach of the Trinitarians in this age; and the countenance which civil powers have, rather forwardly, given to this doctrine, is called "*the giving of power and ſtrength to the beaſt*," Rev. xvii. 13, p. 32. — The doctrine of the Trinity, is even compared to *tranſubſtantiation*; and the worſhip of Chriſt and the Holy Spirit, to the worſhip of a *breaden God*, yea to the *worſhip of the Virgin Mary*, p. 217. — I would fain know the determinate ſignification, of the word *Charity*, if all this can conſiſt with it. — For my part, I thought theſe paſſages of the Apology, rather to favour of *invective* than *Charity*; and calculated rather to promote diſcord, than benevolence and good-will. — 'Tis a picture alſo equally odious, ſhocking, untrue and uncharitable, which this Gentleman gives of the orthodox ſentiments, p. 82, 83, &c. — Writers of his opinion, ſeem to challenge a liberty of miſrepreſenting their opponents, and making them be thought to believe, what

ſentiments, and to make a deep impreſſion on unapprehenſive minds. To what purpoſe is a very conſiderable part of Mr. Lindſey's two firſt chapters, except to lead unwary readers to conceive of the *Unitarians* as a ſet of chriſtians perſecuted for the Truth? and (as expreſſed

---

what they never ſo much as *dreamed of*. — God is not only to be conſidered as the *Parent*, but as the *Moral-Governor* of the world: As ſuch he has given laws, on the obſervance of which, the good of the whole depends: The honour of his government requires, that diſobedience to his laws, be not diſpenſed with: A law without *penal-ſanctions* is of no greater authority than *good advice*: The laws of God, have been moſt atrociouſly violated, by the ſins of men; conſequently puniſhment was due; nor could be evaded without relaxing the force of the law, and opening a way for farther violations: This atonement to the law was made by the obedience and death of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt; the dignity of whoſe *perſon* is conſidered, as enhancing the value of what he did and ſuffered: The love and mercy of God appears in his *acceptance* of this ſatisfaction; when, if he had been *ſtrict to mark our iniquity*, he might *juſtly* have inſiſted on our *own perſonal-ſatisfaction*: It appears yet more, in his *providing* this adequate ſatisfaction; as alſo, that the Lord Jeſus ſo freely gave himſelf a ranſom for many: The benefits of this ſalvation are applied to the ſoul, thro' the influence of the Holy Spirit; and from the diſcoveries which God has made of himſelf, Chriſtians have been induced to worſhip him, as Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt.—But what a monſtrous *caricature* has Mr. Lindſey exhibited of this *plain doctrine!* — *Three equal Gods*; — *One* (the Father) *of ſevere and unrelenting juſtice, revengeful, inexorable without full ſatisfaction*, — *Another* (the Son) *all love, ſtriving as it*

were

preſſed in the Apology, p. 32,) " That the " oppoſite doctrine was firſt eſtabliſhed, and " hath been *all along* ſupported by violence, " and the ſecular power?" In plain Engliſh, That its advocates were univerſally conſcious that it could be ſupported by no other method,

---

were to perſuade the Father to be merciful, and dying to glut the Father's revenge. —*The third* (the Spirit) *attending to beſtow his gracious communications,* and theſe *three Gods but one God.*—Let the reader judge, which of theſe two is the *orthodox opinion.* —It is doubtleſs highly improper, to conceive of God, as ſubject to *paſſions* of *any kind*; but will Mr. Lindſey deny, that, *in accommodation to our ſcanty faculties,* God ſpeaks of himſelf, as determined to ſhew *wrath* againſt ſin? Does he not even ſay *vengeance is mine?* Does not the Apoſtle ſpeak of God as in righteouſneſs taking vengeance, Rom. iii. 5; and as a *conſuming fire,* Heb, xii. 29?—Is not *the chaſtiſement of our peace,* ſaid to have been laid on Chriſt; and that it *pleaſed* the Lord to bruiſe him, and put him to grief, Iſa. liii. 5, 10? Why then is Dr. Watts ſo ſeverely reprehended, for the pious ſentiments quoted from his poems? [Whether he altered his opinions or not, is reſerved for a future enquiry, but] Has he given any more than a *figurative* and *ſcriptural* repreſentation, of peace being made by the blood of the croſs of Chriſt? —But let us admit Mr. Lindſey's poſition for a moment, to be the truth; " God is not ſtrict to demand full ſatis- " faction for a breach of his laws; He will not ſhew " wrath, &c." It will equally follow that in the day of judgment, as well as the caſe of redemption, the Lord will not be ſtrict to mark *every* ſin. —Carry this to the length it will go, and what, conſidering the manifeſt propenſity of men to ſin, is the natural effect of ſuch reaſoning?

method, — that it would not ſtand the teſt of argument, — ſo they fled to the ſword; conſequently, the orthodox are perſecutors? — Is this charitable, or conſiſtent with Mr. Lindſey's profeſſed aim in writing his Apology, viz. "To promote that *Charity*, without which "*a faith that can remove mountains is nothing?*" (Pref. p. iv.) — I am far from denying that *Unitarians* have been perſecuted; ſtill farther would I be from defending ſuch conduct; and this, I dare ſay, is the ſentiment of the orthodox in general at this time of day; it has appeared to be ſo by the ready concurrence of many of them with *Unitarians* and others, in praying for relief from perſecuting laws: — Would it not therefore, have been more pertinently obſerved, that doctrines the moſt ſublime have before now failed of properly affecting the minds of their profeſſors? Our Lord ſaid, that *his kingdom is not of this world*; but this has not prevented his profeſſed-followers from ſtruggling for temporal-

reaſoning? — Why, that every wicked man will look upon God as made up entirely of mercy and love; diſpoſed to paſs by *ſmall ſins*, at leaſt upon a very ſuperficial repentance. — Every wicked man will look upon his own *favourite ſins*, whatever they be, as ſuch *ſmall ſins*. — The force of temptation and a thouſand ſhifts will be pleaded, to extenuate guilt; and I confeſs, I know of no ſyſtem that leads more directly than this does, either in theory or experience, to unconcern about religion altogether; to *practical Antinomianiſm*.

dominion: Our Lord's immediate diſciples contended which ſhould be *greateſt*. Might it not have been more pertinently obſerved, that power, lodged in the hands of men eſpouſing the beſt of opinions, has been often perverted to the worſt of purpoſes?—Men in power have ſometimes, a certain pride in them, that will not bear contradiction.—A miſtaken zeal for God alſo, has hurried even good men to actions, which cooler poſterity has abhorred; hence, the diſciples of Chriſt would have *called for fire from heaven to deſtroy the unkind Samaritans*.—Hence, particular ſyſtems of faith have been eſtabliſhed by human laws, and the leaſt deviation from thoſe ſyſtems, expoſed to unjuſtifiable ſeverities.—If matters merely ceremonial, created ſuch confuſion, and excited ſuch unhallowed fury in the laſt century; no wonder that greater differences have been accounted crimes of a higher nature.—It would have been but fair to have obſerved, that the Arians, when they attained to power, ſhewed no better tempers than the orthodox.—But what does all this prove?—That religion and government ought to be kept entirely diſtinct.—That the magiſtrate's province is the preſervation of the public peace; and that matters of mere opinion do not come properly under his cognizance.—This is the utmoſt to be inferred.—It no more follows that the doctrine of the Trinity is untrue, be-

cauſe

cauſe it has happened to have the countenance of the civil-magiſtrate, than that other uncontroverted points are untrue, for the ſame reaſon; or that chriſtianity itſelf is untrue, becauſe it has been forced into an alliance with the ſtate. It will no more follow, that the doctrine of the *Trinity* is falſe, becauſe it made a part of the charge againſt Servetus, than that the *immateriality of the Deity* is falſe, the denial of which is alſo ſaid to have made a part of his indictment.—It is no juſt conſequence, becauſe eccleſiaſtical-eſtabliſhments have adopted many human-inventions, that therefore every thing adopted by them, is of mere human-invention. —It ought not to be made an objection to a particular doctrine, that "it has had the ſanc-"tion of human authority," till firſt of all it be proved, to have no better ſupport; nor ought any thing to be inſinuated hence, to the prejudice of particular ſentiments, that do not, avowedly or directly, maintain perſecuting principles.—At this rate, what would the world come to? Where would quarrelling end? The very objection raiſed by Unitarians againſt the doctrine of the Trinity, the Anti-pœdobaptiſts might raiſe againſt the baptiſm of infants; the Sabbatarians againſt keeping the Lord's-day; the Quakers againſt poſitive inſtitutions in general; and the Deiſts actually do make againſt the whole chriſtian ſyſtem; "It has been all along ſupported by violence

" and the ſecular-power." — It is a proper maxim in controverſy as well as common-life, *Whatſoever ye would that men ſhould do unto you; do ye even ſo unto them, for this is the law and the prophets.* Matt. vii. 12.

There are many ways of ſilencing an oppoſer.—The dint of authority is one; a multitude of references to learned authors is another. — Unplaced, unpenſioned, and without acceſs to a variety of books, I cannot pretend to traverſe accurately, the facts whereby the Rev. Author would confirm the antiquity and extenſiveneſs, of his favourite notion.—It is poſſible, that there may have been Unitarians even from the apoſtolic-times; eſpecially as Juſtin Martyr records a ſect *which denied that Chriſt was any other than the ſon of Joſeph and Mary.* (e) —But it ſeems to me a little unaccountable, if, according to this gentleman, " *all chriſtians for upwards of* 300 *years after* " *Chriſt, till the council of Nice, were generally* " *Uni-*

(e) Not ſo *candidly* after all, as the gentleman repreſents this Father. — He did not ſpeak of *this ſect* with the appellation of *friends:* Juſtin being in the company of other people beſides Trypho, addreſſed the *company preſent*, by the title of *O, friends!* εἰσὶ τίνες, ω φιλοι, ελεγον, ἀπο του ἡμετέρου γενους ὁμολογοῦντες ἀυτον Χριστον εἶναι, ἀνθρωπον, δε ἐξ ανθρώπων γενὸμενον αποφαινὸμενοι οἰς ὀυ ϛυντιθεμαι: *Jebb's Edit.* 1719, p. 142. It is impoſſible that Juſtin could ſpeak *candidly* of this ſect, as he could not but *hate* the principles they maintained.

" *Unitarians*," that this council ſhould ſo early have had ſuch a majority, as to condemn the doctrine of Arius; to condemn it as a new-broached error; without adverting, that it was then the generally received doctrine; or being aware that it was the very catholic doctrine, which they and their predeceſſors had been all along preaching.—My ſurprize has been great alſo, (upon conſulting the ancient creeds referred to in the Apology, p. 24. and King's Primitive Church, Part II. p. 73.) to find them, contrary to Mr. Lindſey, *expreſsly maintaining the union of the divine and human nature, in the perſon of Chriſt. (f)*—The truth is, that the Author's reaſoning on this head, is rather con-

---

(f) I mean thoſe that ſpeak directly to the ſubject, and from whence any certain concluſion can be drawn for either one ſide or the other; for as it does not ſeem to have been the *diſpute of the day*, theſe Fathers did not ſee a neceſſity, of ſpeaking ſo diſtinctly and poſitively as the Fathers who ſucceeded them; yet Irenœus ſays, all fleſh ſhall be raiſed up, " that every knee may bend to " Jeſus Chriſt," τω Κυριω ἡμῶν, και Θεω, και ϛωτῆρι, και Βαϛιλει, *our Lord and God, and Saviour, and King*; and of his incarnation, *Ipſe per ſe adunans hominem Deo, he in himſelf uniting man to God*, p. 75. Tertullian calls the Son of God, *his own word, which proceeded from himſelf by whom all things were made*, p. 77.—Origen ſays, " It is neceſſary to believe in the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and all the truth," Ἡ περι αὐτου κατα την θεοϖηϛα και την ανθρωποϖηϛα, *which concerns both his God-head and his Manhood*; alſo " that the Son

" was

confuſed; at leaſt it appears ſo to me.— In page 24, he tells us firſt of all, that *all* Chriſtians in theſe ages were Unitarians;— then, in the ſpace of two lines, that *generally* they were Unitarians;—afterwards, p. 158, it ſeems to be acknowledged, that *the Gentile-Fathers were otherwiſe minded*, and believed, (as moſt certainly they did) that Chriſt partook of the divine nature; but in order to qualify this, we are further inſtructed, "that "it was a prejudice derived from their ſtudy "of

---

"was begotten of the Father *before any creature*," ante omnem creaturam, conſequently not himſelf a creature; "that tho' he was God, yet he was incarnate "*and was a Man as really as that he was God*, homo "manſit quod deus erat; and that the Spirit is *joined* "*in dignity and honour with the Father and Son*, honore "ac dignitate patri ac filio ſociatum."—Gregory tells us, that the Father, Son and Spirit are Τριας τελεια, a *perfect Trinity*; and deſcribes the Son of God, in terms that would be now-adays, contemptuouſly dignified with the epithet of *Athanaſian*; and could not conſiſt otherwiſe than with his belief of his ſupreme Deity. —Juſtin Martyr Cum Tryph. p. 191, ſays, that he is to be worſhipped as *God and Chriſt*; ſee the note alſo: And Mr. Jones has produced a paſſage from the prophane Lucian in the ſecond century, in ridicule of the *Trinity in Unity*, ἐν ἐκ τριῶν καὶ ἐξ ἑνὸς τρία, as a generally received doctrine of the Chriſtians; which would not have operated in ridicule of them, if it had not been true that they believed it. *So little the evidence that* all or generally *Chriſtians were Unitarians, for* 300 *years after Chriſt!* See Jones's *Anſwer to the Eſſay on Spirit*, pages 191, 2.

" of the Platonic-philoſophy ;" an aſſertion, of which, by the way, there is no particular proof adduced, except certain convenient preſumptions and ſuppoſitions, and a looſe quotation from Le Clerc, p. 159. (g)— By this means however, the Unitarian-doctrine is confined to the *Jewiſh Chriſtians*; yet not all of the Jewiſh Chriſtians entertained right views of the ſubject; the company is ſtill farther reduced; and at laſt only the *Nazarenes are confeſſed to have been the genuine Unitarians*; a ſect which, (if I am rightly informed) retained *all* the ceremonies of the Old Teſtament worſhip, burdened with all the unmeaning and ſuperſtitious additions of their forefathers the Phariſees; and that differed from the other Jews, little more than in paying Chriſt the compliment, of his being the Meſſiah, while their practices were nearly as corrupt as thoſe of the reſt of their nation; and Mr. Lindſey himſelf cannot deny that they retained *ſome* of the Jewiſh rites.—This is bringing the number into a very narrow compaſs; tho' I am clearly of opinion, that could this Gentleman muſter up, many more ſuch ſects as the pure *Nazarenes*, the *Goths*, the *Vandals* and the *Swevi* (not to mention the *Jews* whom he ſo affectionately calls *the people of*

(g) The reader may ſee the contrary proved in *Parkhurſt's Greek Lexicon*, under the word λόγος, p. 349.

of God, p. 89; but our Lord called *the children of Satan*, John viii. 44.) as afferters of the tenet he contends for; I am clearly of opinion that no orthodox Chriſtian will envy him his company; — Judaizing Chriſtians, and a lawleſs banditti, are not very creditable aſſociates; nor does it ſignify much what they believe.— As to the Neſtorians it does not appear ſo evident that they queſtioned the *real Deity* of the Son of God before his incarnation; *(h)* nor does Moſheim, *as quoted*, ſay ſo; they only objected

---

(h) There is ſomething rather inadmiſſible in this Gentleman's method of deducing the principles of the Neſtorians, p. 27, *Note*, —" Theodore, Biſhop of Mop-" ſueſtia, gave a certain interpretation of Thomas's " exclamation, *My Lord and my God!* John xx, 28. — " The Unitarians found it a convenient hint, and they " embraced it; conſequently Theodore was an Unita-" rian.—The Neſtorians admired Theodore; therefore " the Neſtorians were alſo Unitarians." — I do not ſee that, becauſe the Biſhop gave this ſolution of the text, therefore *neceſſarily* he muſt have been an Unitarian; for good men have ſometimes given a wrong ſenſe of particular texts; and I think, it ſhould firſt of all be proved, that the Biſhop *did* mean it in the Unitarian ſenſe; could mean it in conſiſtency with no other; and that the Neſtorians agreed with him in this ſolution; before the concluſion is drawn. — As to the interpretation, it is no bright ſpecimen of Theodore's *critical abilities*; for the words " Thomas anſwered and ſaid *unto* " *him*, my Lord! and my God!" plainly evince themſelves to be not a ſudden ejaculation to heaven, but a *direct addreſs to Chriſt*. See Doddridge.

jected to the expreſſion, *Mary the Mother of God*, as exceptionable, becauſe it contained an idea of the Deity being conceived in the womb of the virgin, which could only be true of the human-nature, to which the divine nature was united. *(i)*

" But authorities of men are nothing; it is " holy ſcripture alone which can decide this " important point, and to that we muſt make " our final appeal;" Apology, p. 23.—It is of no importance to us therefore, what notions the innocent and ingenious Servetus, nor what Mr. Biddle held: not what Abelard of amorous, or Mr. Whiſton of poſitive and ſelf-complacent-memory entertained: not what Mr. Firmin or Dr. Samuel Clark believed: nor even if it could be proved that Dr. Watts was at length an unitarian, a Sabellian or Socinian. *(k)*—There was no neceſſity of prefixing to a propoſed *ſcriptural* account of the true object

---

(i) " Neſtorius aſſerted that there were two perſons " in Chriſt as well as two natures;" (Doddridge's Lectures, p. 401.) i. e. I ſuppoſe, he maintained that the divine nature ſhould be *ſo far* conſidered ſeparately from the human, as that Mary could not be the mother of our Lord *as God*, but only *as Man*.

(k) To be ſure this has been often aſſerted, and is with ſome ſour diſpoſitions, their favourite topic of declamation.—It has even been malignantly reported, that Dr. Watts left behind him a tract, profeſſedly on the

of divine-worſhip, ſo very flattering a repreſentation of the Author's peculiar way of thinking, unleſs it were to lead the Reader, to prejudge the cauſe before the evidence was heard. *(l)*—*To the law and to the teſtimony* let us appeal;—What does the ſcripture declare of the Son, and Holy Ghoſt?—The Bible muſt at laſt, determine the debate, and by that the doctrine muſt ſtand or fall.

Here then let me obſerve, for the true ſcriptural ſtate of this controverſy, *that the Trinitarians*

---

the inferiority of the Son to the Father, which Dr. Doddridge and Dr. Jennings illiberally ſuppreſſed; a charge that, from all the inquiries I could make, appears totally groundleſs.—Neither can it be fairly inferred from the two pieces mentioned by Mr. Lindſey, that the Doctor favoured the Socinian hypotheſis.—The miſtake which gave ground for this ſurmiſe, was his attempting to explain that which is not to be explained.—What his views, *in the latter part of his life*, were both of the Deity of the Son of God, and the vindication of divine juſtice by the ſacrifice and atonement of Chriſt, may be ſeen in his *Evangelical-Diſcourſes*, publiſhed in 1747, particularly p. 160; where the very doctrine Mr. Lindſey reproves, is ſtrongly inſiſted on; I mean *the pacification of divine wrath by the death of Chriſt*; and p. 163, where the chriſtian is deſcribed as *worſhipping* Chriſt, as *God manifeſt in the fleſh*, and as *one with the Father*.

(l) Inſinuatio [in Exordio videlicet] ſurrepat animis, maxime ubi frons cauſæ non ſatis honeſta eſt, vel quia res ſit improba, *vel quia hominibus parum probetur*.

Quintill. Ed. Rollin. p. 134.

tarians have never denied, that there is a ſenſe, in which the Son and Spirit, are in ſcripture ſpoken of as inferior to the Father.—We acknowledge that our Lord *as man* was inferior; and that as *Mediator* he *humbled* himſelf. — We acknowledge that the ſpirit is ſaid to be *ſent* by the Father, and by Chriſt. John xiv, 26. xv. 26.—Mr. Lindſey produces a number of paſſages, *(m)* to ſhew that our Lord, when on earth, ſpake of himſelf as inferior to, and dependent on the Father; and as doing nothing of himſelf. But who has conteſted all this? Do we not aſſert that being in the *form of a ſervant*, he was in *one reſpect as really a man* as that being *in the form of God*, he was *in another reſpect truly God?*—It will be ſaid, that it is impoſſible, for the divine and human

 nature

(m) The principal and moſt weighty of theſe texts, are John vi. 57. *I live by the Father*, viz. in conjunction with the Father as his meſſenger.—John vii 16. *My doctrine is not mine, but his that ſent me*, i. e. not a doctrine *ſeparate from the will* of the Father, and it is farther explained, *v.* 17. by being *not of himſelf*, his own invention, or a doctrine merely human, to which purpoſe alſo, is John xii. 49.—xiv. 28, *My Father is greater than I*, is moſt evidently ſpoken of his *ſtate of humiliation*, becauſe it is urged as the reaſon why his diſciples ought to have *rejoiced in his going to the Father.* q. d. "Ye ought to rejoice that I am about to leave "this world; becauſe I am now in a ſtate of inferiority "and humiliation; the Father is greater than I am, as "I now appear." In verſe 9th, he had ſaid, *He that hath ſeen me, hath ſeen the Father.*

nature to be thus united in one perſon; but ſurely, it was as poſſible for the Son of God to unite himſelf to the human-nature, (inconceivable as the *manner* of it may be) as it was poſſible for him to have inveſted himſelf with the nature of angels; *(n)* yet the Apoſtle, in Hebrews ii. 16, ſpeaks of it as a great favour to us, that he did not, plainly implying that he *might* have done it, if he had pleaſed.—The plain ſtate of the queſtion is this, "Is "there

(n) Had the Son of God taken the *Angelic nature* into union with himſelf, in what *manner* could this union have been effected? Here would have been no *body* for any *ſuperangelic ſpirit* to have inhabited, (as the Anti-Trinitarians affirm, was the caſe in our Lord's incarnation) for the angels are purely ſpiritual. The union then, between him and their nature, muſt have been in ſome *manner* altogether inconceivable by us; and where is the greater difficulty of aſſerting him to be God, and to have taken the *human nature* into union with himſelf, even tho' we cannot deſcribe the *manner* of this union?—I know no way of evading the force of Heb. ii. 16, but by ſuppoſing that ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι in this place ſignifies to *help*; but this is ſtraining the word; there is no place in the New-teſtament where its natural and preciſe ſignification is *to help*.—The *intention* of our Lord's incarnation, was doubtleſs to *help men*; but the preciſe idea conveyed by this verb, reſpects *the means whereby* he helped them, viz. by *being made fleſh*.—The ſtrict and literal meaning, is *to take hold of, to take on*, i. e. inveſt; and the verſe well rendered, *he took not on* him, (he inveſted not himſelf with the nature of) *the Angels*; *but* he took on him *the ſeed of Abraham*.

" there that honour and reſpect, paid to Chriſt " in the Bible, that would lead Chriſtians to " view him *(in a ſenſe different from his humi-* " *liation, and independent of his mediatorial-* " *character)* as God? And are there ſuch " aſcriptions to the Holy-Spirit in ſcripture, " as warrant our conceiving of the Spirit as " God?" *(o)* Mr. Lindſey denies this, and tells us that our Lord himſelf in John xvii. 3, calls the Father, *the only true God*; Ap. p. 6. The ſame is repeated alſo, p. 217; and it has been ſo often repeated, and the argument from it in favour of the Unitarian-ſcheme, ſo often refuted, that I am ſurprized that gentlemen are not aſhamed to urge it. We do not deny, that the Father is the *only true God*, in oppoſition to a *heatheniſh-plurality of Gods*; but did our Lord,

---

(o) The Jews, conſulting only one ſide of the queſtion, from the grand deſcriptions of the Meſſiah's original ſtate, of his exaltation, and the glories of his ſpiritual kingdom, expected that he would have appeared on earth as a *triumphant conqueror*; forgetting that he was alſo to be *a man of ſorrows, and acquainted with grief*; from this imperfect notion therefore, they *deſpiſed and rejected him*; and it is a miſtake ſomewhat ſimilar, that is made by thoſe that deny the *Deity* of Chriſt; looking only to the deſcriptions of his human-nature, and mediatorial character; they loſe ſight of other ſcriptures, which ſpake alſo of his *proper Deity*; which ſhould be viewed in conjunction with the former; and by which means, Chriſt may be conſidered as *God*, yet *manifeſt in the fleſh*. 1 Tim. ii. 1, 6.

Lord, in this place, intend to except himſelf? Did he mean that he was not God? Did he not in the former Chapter, (John xvi. 15.) ſay, *ALL THINGS that the Father hath, are mine?* And is not the very title of the *true God* in another place applied to Chriſt, 1 John v. 20?—This text is no more to be taken to the exception of the *Son*, than Jude 25, (where Chriſt is expreſsly called, the *only wiſe God*,) *(p)* is of the *Father*.—In like manner, the Son is called the *Bleſſed and only Potentate, King of Kings, and Lord of Lords*. 1 Tim. vi. 15. Yet not to the exception of the Father; or

(p) "It ſeems to me, that the divine perſon here "moſt immediately intended, is *our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, "who is principally ſpoken of all along in the preceding context, and is often ſtiled, by way of eminence, "*the Saviour*, and *God our Saviour*, as in Eph. v. 23. "Phil. iii. 20. Tit. ii. 13. 2 Pet. i. 1. and is here "called the *only wiſe God*, not to the excluſion of the "Father and Spirit, but only of all Idols, John xvii. 3. "And as his *preſenting us faultleſs, before the preſence of "his glory*, verſe 24, manifeſtly relates to the time of "his glorious appearing to Judgment, for executing "a dreadful ſentence on the Ungodly, and ſhewing "mercy to believers unto eternal life, (*v.* 14, 15, 21.) "So this exactly agrees with the work, [*of preſenting "the Church to himſelf*,] that is peculiarly aſcribed to "him, as the *Saviour of the Body*, and *Head of the "Church*, Eph. v. 23—27. But I don't find that the "*Preſentation* of the church at the laſt day, *is ever "aſcribed to God the Father*."

Guyſe's Paraphraſe, in locum.

or if it be contended that the Father is meant there, yet certainly not to the excluſion of the Son, who is indiſputably called, in Rev. xvii. 14, *King of Kings, and Lord of Lords.*—So in Matt. xi. 27, the Father is ſaid *only* to know the Son, and the Son only to know the Father, and yet, 1 Cor. ii. 10, the *Spirit* is ſaid to *ſearch all things, even the deep things of God*; and in the very next verſe, is ſaid *excluſively* to *know the things of God*, yet certainly not excluding the Son. *(q)* In ſhort, nothing is more clear than that our Lord in this text, ſpeaks of himſelf merely as the Mediator or *ſent of God*; but Mr. Lindſey has prevented this remark, by an apt quotation from *Grotius*, which was written at firſt, I am perſwaded, with a different view from that of its tranſplantation into the *Apology*; "*de ſe modeſte, in tertia perſona* "*loquitur*," tho' I confeſs, I have not diſcernment enough to underſtand, how Jeſus ſpake of himſelf *modeſtly*, [*modeſte*] if there was not a ſenſe, in which he was entitled to *higher honours* than he claims in this verſe; we never account it modeſty in an Ambaſſador, not to pretend to be his Sovereign. *(r)*

A capital

(q) See this text illuſtrated in a pamphlet, in the controverſy between Evans and Harwood, entitled, *A Reply to a Letter to the Rev. Caleb Evans.* Printed for Buckland, 1766.

(r) It is now become ſo faſhionable, among many of the friends, as well as the enemies of the doctrine

of

A capital article however and principally decisive in this controversy, is, *whether worship is in scripture offered to Christ and to the Holy Spirit?* Mr. Lindsey seems aware of this; for tho' he does in a slight manner, incidentally, speak of Christ as *intercessor*, he plainly declares, p. 177, "*that we ought not to address prayer, to the Man Christ Jesus*, even *as Mediator*;" and p. 141, he maintains, "the impropriety of prayer to him, "*at all unless he be the supreme God.*" We readily agree with the Rev. Author in this; and heartily approve of Archb. Tennison's words, "that to suppose Christ a creature, "yet

---

of the Trinity, to cry down the authenticity of, 1 John v. 7. (*see Michaelis's lectures*, p. 381; *Velthusen's defence of the three first chapters of St. Matthew*, p. 23.) that an attempt to defend it, would be thought ridiculous, and be sufficient to fasten the imputation of *illiterate*, upon the defender. — I chuse rather, to suspend my own judgment of the matter, freely confessing my incompetency for the determination; yet perswaded that the words contain an important truth, sufficiently supported by other parts of scripture, whether they were in the original copies or not.—But I cannot dismiss this text, without inserting the opinion of Mr. *Simon Brown* concerning it, "It seems an argument with me, that "the famous text in *John*, was no interpolation of the "*Athanasians*; for if for their purpose, they inserted this "passage, why did they not make it speak home? And "to *these Three are one*, have added, *consubstantial*, *co-*"*equal*, and *co-eternal*, and carried the point against "all opposers?" —— *Brown's Answer to Christianity, as old as the Creation*, p. 180.

" yet to give worſhip to him, is an abſolute in-
" conſiſtency, and a ſpecies of idolatry." (ſ) —
Worſhip indeed ſignifies the higheſt expreſſion of reſpect, that can be paid by one Being to another; and as there are paſſages of ſcripture, that *look like* the giving worſhip to Chriſt and to the Spirit, Mr. Lindſey ſtrenuouſly labours to put a *different gloſs* upon them. — He begins p. 103, with the *baptiſmal-form*, Matt. xxviii. 19. — Baptiſm is an inſtitution of Chriſt, whereby his diſciples enter upon the public profeſſion of his religion. Some chriſtians think it alſo, an appointed method, of devoting their infant-offſpring to God. — Take it in either way, it has been juſtly conſidered as a very high act of worſhip; yea, one of the higheſt acts of devotion a man can be engaged in; and the Father, the Son, and

(ſ) " To ſay that Chriſt is a Creature, yet made
" ſuch a God, who can hear all prayers, ſupply all
" wants, give all graces needful to his body the
" Church, know all the ſecrets of all thoughts not
" directed to him, govern and judge with wiſdom all
" the world, and to worſhip him under this divine
" notion; what is it elſe than paying homage to a
" preſumed creature, which is due only to the one very
" God? For what apprehenſions greater than theſe do
" we entertain, concerning the true God, when we
" call upon him, confide in him, or revere him?"

Tenniſon of Idolatry, Ch. ix. p. 174.

the Holy Ghoſt, being mentioned in the form, without any diſtinction made of *ſuperior* and *inferior reſpect*, it has from thence been concluded that *equal* honour is paid to *each*; who of conſequence, are the *one God* ſpoken of in the Bible.—Mr. Lindſey ſays *not*; and p. 107, he profeſſes to produce other paſſages, which he preſumes are parallel, and confute this notion, *becauſe that in theſe paſſages, God is mentioned in conjunction with other Beings, confeſſedly inferior*; from whence he infers, that the Son and Spirit being joined with the Father in this act of worſhip, is no argument of equality. —The firſt text he brings, is 1 Tim. v. 21. *I charge thee*, ſaith the Apoſtle, *before God and the elect Angels*; but this proves juſt *nothing*; for the Apoſtle is *not here in an act of worſhip*, either to God or the elect angels. As little can be drawn from 1 Sam. xii. 18, *the people greatly feared the Lord and Samuel*; for the hiſtorian is not ſpeaking of *worſhip* to God or Samuel, but the effect of a remarkable miracle, in convincing the Iſraelites of the awfulneſs of God, and the authority of his prophet.—With no greater force of evidence are ſeveral other texts there cited. The only one of any weight, is 1 Chron. xxix. 20, *the people worſhipped the Lord and the King*.—I imagine this is thought to be deciſive of the point; and I have no doubt but it is.—

Mr.

Mr. Lindſey's argument, if I do not miſtake it, will ſtand thus,

Divine worſhip is alone due to God:
But
David is, in conjunction with God, ſaid here to be worſhipped; tho' certainly no object of divine worſhip.——Therefore,

In the baptiſmal-form, the Son and Spirit may be mentioned, in conjunction with the Father, and yet no objects of divine worſhip. Q. E. D.

But while I freely admit the premiſes, I am obliged to draw a different concluſion from the Author's.—Divine worſhip is honour of the higheſt nature, and due only to God; but ſovereign-princes are in ſcripture, in an *accommodated ſenſe*, called Gods; becauſe, inveſted with the higheſt *worldly* dignity and authority, they are ſupreme here below, and *emblems of him, whoſe kingdom ruleth over all.* —In the ſame accommodated ſenſe therefore, worſhip is attributed to them, i. e. in the higheſt *worldly* ſenſe; ſo in this text, each had the *higheſt reſpect of its kind*, paid to him: to God was given *religious* worſhip; to the King *civil* worſhip, viz. *homage*. As it is not diſputed therefore, but that, in the baptiſmal-form, there is *ſome ſort* of reſpect or honour paid to the Son and Spirit, by their being mentioned together with the Father; the only

remaining queſtion is, " Do we intend " honour *civil*, or *religious?*" The *firſt* is foreign to the diſpute. *Religious* honour, is therefore meant, i. e. they are worſhipped as partaking of deity, in conjunction with the Father; *(t)* for, with Mr. Lindſey, I cannot ſuppoſe an inferior ſort of religious worſhip, as

---

(t) This argument from 1 Chron. xxix. 20, being ſpecious and *popular*, is reſumed in a note to the introductory ſermon at Eſſex-Houſe, p. 24, as a kind of reply to the preſumedly religious worſhip, that is enjoined to Chriſt in Heb. i. 6. *Let all the angels of God worſhip him.* — Mr. Lindſey ſays, that " this is not *re-* " *ligious* worſhip." I beg to know what worſhip then? In my apprehenſion, it muſt be either worſhip *civil* or *religious*; I can ſtrike no logical medium between the two.—But he ſays that " *Worſhip* is a relative term, of " different ſignification, according to the ſubject to " which it is applied." — Be it ſo; It intends however the *higheſt* honour *of the kind*; either of a *worldly* or a *ſpiritual* nature. — In any other view of its *different* ſignification, I cannot ſee any propriety in the *angel's* prohibiting John from worſhipping *him*, ſaying, *worſhip God*, Rev. xxii. 9. — Might he not, upon Mr. Lindſey's principles, have lawfully accepted of John's worſhip, as a proper mark of reſpect to him, in his preſent ſtation and character? — In truth it ſeems clear that John had miſtook this Perſonage for Chriſt himſelf; and accordingly would have worſhipped him, 'till the angel inſtructed him better who he was. — But if, by this word *different*, the Author means *ſuperior* and *inferior* honour of the *ſame kind or nature*; ſuppoſe that, for the ſake of illuſtration, we take it in a *civil* ſenſe; ſuppoſe that inſtead of the word *worſhip*, we ſubſtitute the more

as long as that command is in force, *thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* Deut. x. 20. Mat. iv. 10; and it is forbid *to do ſervice to them which by nature are not Gods*, Gal. iv. 8.

It will ſtrengthen what I have obſerved here, if we take notice of one or two of Mr. Lindſey's own conceſſions on this part of the ſubject, viz. "That this "form was not always adhered to in the "adminiſtration of baptiſm, p. 105," for which he refers us to Acts xi. 38, *be baptized every one of you in the name of the Lord Jeſus*, and other places.—It appears to me not improbable, that tho' the names of the Father and Spirit are not expreſsly enumerated in this paſſage,

---

more common word *homage* into the Author's definition, and ſay "Homage is a relative term, of different [i. e. "*ſuperior* or *inferior*] ſignification, according to the "ſubject to which it is applied." Does not the fallacy of the reaſoning appear very plainly? — Would it not be ridiculous, to give *homage* to an ambaſſador, becauſe he, in a ſenſe, perſonates his king? To give *homage* to a prime-miniſter, becauſe he directs the affairs of government? Or to magiſtrates, becauſe they adminiſter juſtice, by commiſſion from their Royal Maſter?— Is not *homage* a prerogative peculiar to *Sovereigns*, by whatever *titles* they are called? And can there be a *ſuperior* kind of *homage*, proper for a *Monarch*, and another kind of *homage* for his *ſubjects*? — As far as I underſtand things, I preſume not; nor that there can be any *religious worſhip*, without the acknowledgement of the *divinity of the object*, to which it is addreſſed.

paſſage, yet that they are implied, and were united with that of the Son, in the *actual-adminiſtration* of this ſacred ordinance; but what if we admit Mr. Lindſey's poſition to be juſt? He will not deny but that the adminiſtration of baptiſm in the name of the Father implies divine worſhip to *him*; but it is remarkable, that tho' we have the name of Chriſt mentioned, without the Father or Spirit, we do not read of baptiſm, in the name of the Father or Spirit, without the Son; and what will follow from hence? Why that there is ſuch dignity in the perſon of Chriſt, that the glory and grace of God as Father and Holy Spirit centre in him; and that baptiſm, an high act of religious worſhip and devotion, cannot be properly adminiſtered without a religious regard *to him*, i. e. worſhip given to him; and thus the argument, which the author delivers with ſuch an air of triumph, turns out the very reverſe of what he meant it to be, *it makes directly againſt him*; as likewiſe does his reaſoning, from 1 Cor. i. 15. p. 108; for the Apoſtle knew, that baptiſm was ſo ſacred an inſtitution, and the worſhip rendered in it ſo *completely divine*, that he rejoiced, becauſe he had not baptized any of theſe diſorderly Corinthians; leſt they ſhould have been tempted to give that honour to *him* the meſſenger, which was due to his *Lord* who ſent him.

This

This point ſettled, and worſhip I hope proved from hence, to belong to the Son and Spirit; it will make way for our obviating other difficulties with leſs trouble. In ſeveral parts of the New-Teſtament hiſtory, we find people ſo ſtruck with the majeſty of Chriſt's appearance, and the aſtoniſhing grandeur of his miracles, that, beholding his glory, (the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, John i. 14.) they *worſhipped him*; and he ſhewed that he did not *diſcourage* ſuch worſhip, becauſe he did not at any time *prevent* it; (ſee Mat. viii. 2.—xv. 25.—xxviii. 17. John ix. 38. &c.) He did not indeed, *profeſſedly inſiſt* upon worſhip, when upon earth; for that would not have been conſiſtent with his ſtate of *voluntary humiliation*; and this remark will ſuperſede many of the Rev. Author's objections. For inſtance,

Page 7th, he tells us, "that the malicious "Jews, *perverting* our Lord's words, *calumni-* "*ated him*, as making himſelf *equal with God*," John v. 18.—A ſimilar *calumny* we have quoted from John x. 33; the Jews charged him with blaſphemy, for that *he being*, as they thought, *a mere man, made himſelf God.* However, as we go along, we are taught to underſtand, that by the expreſſions of "*making himſelf* "*God*, and *equal with God*, the Jews af- "ter all, did not really mean *God* and *equal* "*with God*; but only the *aſſuming a* "*divine*

"*divine power and authority.*" — But does the Author *ſeriouſly* think that they meant *nothing more* by theſe phraſes? According to this interpretation then, the paſſage John x. 33, muſt in the ſpirit of it, have run thus; *not for a good work do we ſtone thee, but for blaſphemy, and becauſe that thou being a man, aſſumeſt a divine power and authority*; which is ſo *weak*, that the Author has too much ingenuity to be ſtill inſenſible, that this is *not* the meaning of the phraſes. *(u)* — Suppoſe Mr. Lindſey's explanation to be the true one; and admit, that it was a calumny for the Jews to aſſert that Chriſt "aſſumed a divine power "and authority, *without any warrant for it*;" yet what made it ſo worthy of particular obſervation, that he, *being a Man*, aſſumed ſuch authority? Would he have been the only *Man* that had pretended to a divine commiſſion? — In truth, nothing can be more unnatural than the Author's illuſtration of theſe two paſſages:

In

(u) It is not improbable, that the expreſſion *Son of God*, applied to the Meſſiah, did, according to the received opinions of the Jews, ſignify one poſſeſſed of the divine nature; the hint of which was perhaps drawn from the 2d Pſalm; and if this was the general acceptation of the phraſe, then we learn what ſenſe to put upon the Eunuch's confeſſion of faith, in anſwer to Philip's enquiry, Acts viii. 37. viz. That, *with all his heart*, he believed in and received Chriſt Jeſus, as *the true God and almighty Saviour*. Ap. p. 105.

In John v. 17, Jesus said, *My Father worketh hitherto, and I work:* (*v*) In John x. 30, *I and my Father are one.* By the *former*, the Jews understood him to pretend to the same works as God; and by calling God his Father, to exalt himself to the rank of Deity, of which they took the *latter* passage to be a more ex-

 plicit

(*v*) John i. 1—5, is so clear an illustration of the *extent* in which the works done by the Father are done also by the Son, that Mr Lindsey, p. 89, is obliged to suppose the *Logos* or *Word of God*, to be only an *Hebraism* for God himself; which is granting more than he is aware of, or would be willing to allow; for verse 14, that very *word*, who is *v.* 1, called *God*, and *v.* 3, *by whom all things were made*, is said to have been *made flesh, and* to *dwell among us.* — The Apostle *John* has a like way of speaking, 1 John iii. 1—5, which may with considerable strength be urged in proof of the Son's supreme Deity. — *Behold*, says he, *what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the Sons of God*; after which he goes on to speak of the *same person* who is here called *God*; and *v.* 5, declares him to have been made *manifest to take away our sins*, i. e. the Son of God is *really that God whose children we are*; and *He* was *manifest in the flesh* for the purposes of our salvation. — If it be objected, "that here is not a proper distinction, preserved be-"tween the Father and Son," I can only answer as Mr. Lindsey does somewhere, "that the Apostles called "the Father and Son, *Lord, Saviour*, and (I may add "*God*) promiscuously, without entering into the conside-"ration, that any persons would mistake these expres-"sions as if spoken of two different *Beings*," which they always *understood of one Being* in *different respects.*

plicit confeſſion; therefore they would have ſtoned him as a blaſphemer.—"But they per-" verted his words and calumniated him we " are told." Our Lord in his defence, did " not pretend to be God, nor equal with God." And it is as certain that he did not *deny* the charge brought againſt him; and why he did not inſiſt upon it more openly we have juſt ſeen. But in John v. 19, he ſaid, " the Son " can do nothing of himſelf, but what he " ſeeth the Father do." True! And if other paſſages of ſcripture prove him to be God, nothing more can be inferred from this, than that, as Mediator, he acted agreeable to the will of the Father, and the errand which he came upon; and *could not, conſiſtently with the end of his miſſion*, act otherwiſe. When we ſay that God *cannot* ſin; we do not ſuppoſe this truth, any implication of weakneſs in God; and tho' we grant freely that our Lord does in other places, ſpeak of himſelf in the character of inferiority; the remaining clauſe of *this* verſe, makes it plain, that he had it not in view here; for *what things ſoever* the Father *doth, theſe alſo doth the Son likewiſe.*—In the ſame chapter, *v.* 22, 23, Chriſt ſaith, that the " Father hath committed all judgment to the " Son; that all men ſhould honour the Son, " (καθὼς τιμῶσι τον πατὲρα) *even as* they ho-" nour the Father;" Mr. Lindſey maintains that

that this honour was not to be paid to him "ſo much on his own account, as out "of reſpect to God who ſent him," p. 8.— And when he will prove that an Ambaſſador has the *ſame reſpect*, (I don't mean in the *ſame degree*, but reſpect of the *ſame nature*) given to him, as to his ſovereign, we'll hearken to him. The houſholder in Matt. xxi. 33, who, after ſending his ſervants to the huſbandmen unſucceſsfully, at laſt ſent *his Son*, ſaying, *they will reverence my Son*, *v.* 37, expected not the ordinary reſpect of a *ſervant* to be given to him; but *particular honour*, *as the ſon of his body*, *and the heir of his eſtate.*

The candid Reader will excuſe me, that I have not animadverted on the paſſages in the ſame order that they lie in the book. The Apology is ſo exceedingly rhapſodical, that it is rather difficult to bring things under any arrangement.—Page 113, another text is propoſed by the Author, as containing, in the opinion of the orthodox, the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity; viz. 1 Cor. xii. 4, 5, 6, *Now there are diverſities of gifts*, *but the ſame Spirit. And there are differences of adminiſtrations*, *but the ſame Lord. And there are diverſities of operations*, *but it is the ſame God*, *that worketh in all.* I hope this is not brought as one of the *principal* texts, that ſeemingly favour this doctrine. There is certainly no-

thing *demonstrative* in it on either side; but admitting it to be proved from other scriptures, that the Son and Spirit are God, and worshipped as such in the sacred writings; this text may be not improperly considered as a *description* of the doctrine of the Trinity.

2 Cor. xii. 14, is more to our purpose: The Apostle prays for his Corinthian friends; *the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy-Ghost, be with you all.*—Mr. Lindsey's remark, "that "the words Holy-Ghost, may perhaps signify "the gift of the Holy-Ghost, as in Acts xi. 38," makes nothing for him; unless he proves that these gifts and assistances do not proceed from *one personally spoken of* in the Bible, under the name and title of the Holy-Ghost: — "But "this is not a prayer we are told, but a *pious* "*wish*," (Ap. p. 115, repeated also p. 144.) And I ask "what is a *wish?*" It is either a *prayer*, or it is *prophaneness*.—It is either a lifting up of the heart to God; or it is a desire of the mind, without any acknowledgment of God, the fountain and giver of all good.—Which is the most probable view of this apostolic-benediction? Will Mr. Lindsey say, that the Apostle wished these blessings for his correspondents, without putting the wish up as a prayer to God the *Father?* — It would shew the wish not to be a *pious* one; and the Apostle

to

to be deſtitute of true religion. (w) — If then he put it up to the *Father*, he did the ſame to the *Son*, and to the *Holy-Ghoſt*, who are regarded by him equally, and without any diſtinction of inferiority.

Upon the ſame principle alſo, two other paſſages, quoted p. 131, are juſtly looked on as prayers; viz. 1 Cor. i. 3. *Grace to you, and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* Rom. i. 7. 1 Theſſ. iii. 3. *Now God himſelf, even our Father and our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, direct our way to you.* 2 Theſſ. ii. 16. — Nor does the objection from Rev. i. invalidate the argument; for the *ſeven ſpirits* there ſpoken of, are naturally explained as a ſymbolical repreſentation of the Holy-Ghoſt, in alluſion to the variety of gifts flowing from him.—If they intend any inferior ſpirits, I am at a loſs to account for the precedence in rank given them here to Chriſt, who is *the firſt and the laſt*, *v.* 17; and if they do not intend

(w) Mr. Emlyn's argument, that this is a mere wiſh and not a prayer, drawn from Col. iv. 18, *Grace be with you all*, is downright ſhuffling; and diſcovers nothing more than Mr. Emlyn's ſkill in the arts of reaſoning. "We might as well, ſays he, ſuppoſe this to "be a prayer to grace." Undoubtedly it was a prayer *for* grace. Can we imagine the pious Apoſtle to *wiſh* for it without *praying* for it? The whole then is juſt as if he had ſaid, "*I pray that* grace may be with you "all," and ſhews that the prayer was put up, *not to grace, but to the God of Grace.*

intend the Holy-Ghoſt, I am equally puzzled to account for it, that *while other ſpirits are mentioned,* (x) he ſhould be omitted; ſeeing that grace and peace, which are here wiſhed for, are communicated thro' the ſpirit's influence, and, upon almoſt every hypotheſis, he is allowed to be ſuperior to the higheſt created angels. *See Doddridge's Note in locum.*

Tho' this argument is concluſive of itſelf, whatever be the meaning of the lamb's *ſeven eyes, which are the ſeven ſpirits of God, ſent into all the earth,* Rev. v. 6; yet with propriety, may *they* be interpreted of the ſame ſpirit, *whoſe influences proceed thro' the mediation of the Son, and extend thro' the whole church.* — Angels or meſſengers cannot be intended; "because (as a great Author obſerves) the "title *Spirits of God,* is not a term applied "to angels." (y) To which I add, that the reaſoning of the Rev. Apologiſt from ſuch texts as theſe, muſt needs be indeterminate; as it goes upon a grand critical error: I "thought, *(till now)* that dark places were to "be

(x) It is acknowledged, that in the texts immediately preceding, the Father, and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt are named, without any *expreſs* notice of the ſpirit; *but not while other beings inferior to the ſpirit, are mentioned.*

(y) "Vocantur ſeptem hi ſpiritus *ſpiritus Dei*; quo "nomine, creatum ullum ſpiritum in ſacris dici, non "memini." *Witſii Exercitationes in Symbolum,* p. 386.

" be illuſtrated by places plain and unadorned,
" not the plain by the dark and figurative."

Beſides theſe objections of the Author, againſt the generally received doctrine of the Trinity; he profeſſes p. 128, to produce the principal texts " alledged to authorize prayer " to our Lord Jeſus Chriſt;" I ſuppoſe he means diſtinct addreſſes to Chriſt *in particular*; and we allow that it will be difficult to determine *certainly* concerning ſome of them, that they are addreſſes to Chriſt *in particular*, and *diſtinct from the Father and the Spirit*; nor do we ſuppoſe that judicious perſons lay any great ſtreſs on them as ſuch. Theſe are, Acts i. 24, *And they prayed and ſaid, Thou Lord which knoweſt the hearts of all men, &c.* 2 Cor. xii. 8, *For this thing I beſought the Lord thrice*; tho' the *latter* looks very much like an addreſs to Chriſt in particular, by the Apoſtle's ſpeaking of the *power of Chriſt reſting upon him*, *v.* 9. — On the former however it is agreed, that Chriſt *ſearcheth the heart*, Rev. ii. 23. The words are very ſtrong: *I am he which ſearcheth the reins and hearts*; q. d. " I am that very Being, " whom ye have ever heard ſpoken of, as " ſearching the inmoſt receſſes of the mind, " Jer. xvii. 10." (z) — But the Author ſays, " that

(z) Mark xiii. 34, Our Lord ſays, " of that day, " viz. *of judgment*, and that hour knoweth no man, no " not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son " but

"that this was a *derived power*." — For my part, extenſive as the capacities of ſuperior creatures may be, I never could conceive of omniſcience as communicable to a creature; nor yet, how our Lord could judge the *ſecrets* of

---

"but the Father." 'Tis inſiſted from hence, Ap. p. 204, that Chriſt is not in any ſenſe omniſcient; in anſwer to this, ſome good Critics have thought that the verb *to know* ſignifies to *make known*, as in 1 Cor. ii. 2. q. d. "No man hath a commiſſion to make known this "event, no not the angels, nor even the Son, *till the proper time comes for him to reveal it.*" (See Macknight's note on this text.) But, allowing the former ſenſe, according to the ſcriptural account of his being in one view, *really a man*, there is no greater difficulty in this, than in its being ſaid of him, that he *grew in wiſdom, and ſtature*, Luke ii. 52: both certainly muſt relate to his inferior nature. — And here, by the way let me obſerve, that this circumſtance, of our Lord's *growing in wiſdom as in ſtature*, can only conſiſt with theſe two opinions; — either, that he had *no exiſtence at all* previous to his coming into this world; — or that his human-nature conſiſted of *a body and a ſoul diſtinct from his Deity*; for on the ſuppoſition of his being *a ſuperior but created ſpirit, deſcending from heaven, and inhabiting a human body*; there is to me as much difficulty, as any objection drawn from the incomprehenſibleneſs of the doctrine of the Trinity, to conceive how ſuch a ſuperior ſpirit, ſhould be ſo far diveſted of and forget all his former ideas, as to have only the limited conceptions of a child, and grow in wiſdom as he advanced in years; for this hypotheſis, firſt of all ſuppoſes him to be of a higher rank (and conſequently ſuperior luſtre, diſcernment and knowledge, than all other created Beings; and then, to

be

of all hearts, (Rom. ii. 16.) unleſs he is poſſeſſed of omniſcience.—The text brought to prove this communicated omniſcience, relates to the *authority* which Chriſt has committed to him as mediator, viz. Matt. xxviii. 18. *All power is given me in heaven, and in earth*; but it is a text that argues ſtrongly for his proper Deity, as it would otherwiſe be impoſſible for him to have a capacity equal to the management of *all things in heaven and in earth.*

Others of the ſcriptures quoted, as addreſſes to Chriſt, are more poſitive; one of which is Stephen's prayer, Acts vii. 5.9. *And they ſtoned Stephen invoking, and ſaying, Lord Jeſus receive my ſpirit.* What ſhall Mr. Lindſey do with this? "There is no doubt, ſays he, but Ste-"phen *made this requeſt, addreſſed this Prayer* "to the Lord Jeſus Chriſt," p. 129.—A moſt unhappy conceſſion! He grants all we aſk.—"But Stephen, he adds, *ſaw* the Lord *with*

 "*his*

---

be in the capacity of an infant growing up to maturity, and acquiring knowledge *gradually*, as he did ſtature of body; which is to my mind quite an inconſiſtency, even tho' we acknowledge, that he ſoon diſcovered himſelf, to have more knowledge abundantly than other children. —Was our Lord then a *mere man*, that *like ourſelves* had no exiſtence before his birth into this world? He himſelf contradicts this notion in John xvii. 5, by ſpeaking *of the glory which he had with the Father before the world was.* The conſequence is obvious, that theſe things cannot be reconciled upon any other principles than thoſe of his *real Deity* and *real humanity*.

" *his eyes*, and ſo this can be no precedent for " directing prayer to him *unſeen*." — Pray, where was the greater reaſon, for praying to him *ſeen* than *unſeen*? Becauſe Stephen in a viſion *ſaw* the glory of God, and the Lord Jeſus *in heaven*, ſtanding on the right hand of God; was the throne of God, and Jeſus on the right hand of God, nearer to Stephen, than they are to thoſe that pray now? — Becauſe Stephen *ſaw* the *Son of Man*, was he a greater object of worſhip, or better able to help Stephen then if *unſeen*? " But he called " him the Son of Man."—And he called him right: One of the prophetical titles of the Meſſiah was the *Son of Man*, Dan. vii. 13: Our Lord really was ſo; and, in his human nature, he aſcended into heaven. But if Chriſt was in no ſenſe greater than Son of Man, why did Stephen, when he ſaw *the glory of God*, pray to Chriſt *a creature*, and not go *immediately to God*, whoſe glory he beheld? *(a)* — It will require ſome dexterity, upon this Gentleman's principles, to acquit even St. Stephen of the ſame idolatry he charges ſo liberally on chriſtians in this dark and corrupt æra of the church; and as the petition of John,

p. 133.

(a) God invites and commands us to addreſs ourſelves, upon all occaſions *immediately to himſelf*, and he is able to do more abundantly for us, than any other being, tho' ever ſo great and perfect. *Ap.* p. 137.

p. 133. *Amen, even ſo, come Lord Jeſus!* Rev. xxii. 20, (a reply as it is to our Lord's declaration, *ſurely, I come quickly*, yet) is evidently a prayer to him to haſten his ſecond appearance; ſo unleſs the Author can inform us how, if Chriſt was a creature, he had the diſpoſal of the event prayed for; and how, if Chriſt was a mere creature, it was more proper to pray to *him, whom the Apoſtle ſaw*, than *to the Angel whom the Apoſtle ſaw*; it will be hard to clear this Apoſtle alſo of blame, in giving that religious worſhip to a creature, which the Author ſays very juſtly p. 137, "is the incommunicable "honour and prerogative of God alone."

Theſe things being premiſed, will confirm the true ſenſe of 1 Cor. i. 2, *With all that in every place call upon the name of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* Acts ix. 14.—Mr. Lindſey informs us that it ſhould have been tranſlated, "called "*by* the name of Chriſt," p. 132, for which he quotes Dr. Hammond as *rightly* vouching. —I am ſorry to have occaſion to ſay that, except the authority of Dr. Hammond, there is not the leaſt argument offered on this text. —All is mere aſſertion.—And this is an unhappy ſpecimen of the inconſiſtency of certain gentlemen, who violently declaim againſt human authorities in matters of religion; but who, when human authorities will ſerve their own turn, are as fond of them as other people.— "Dr. Hammond ſays ſo."—Admitted.—

What then?—I am grieved to find ſo great a man, giving ſo indigeſted and ungrammatical a turn, to ſo plain a phraſe.—There is an unſurmountable objection to the paſſive ſignification of ἐπικαλουμένοις in this place, that the Noun immediately following it, is in the *Accuſative caſe*; whereas had the Doctor's ſenſe been as *right* as the Author judges it, the Noun muſt have been in the *Dative*, as it is in the *ſeptuagint verſion* of Iſa. xliv. 5.—What a pity that the Author had not found out ſome manuſcript, where it is ὀνόματι inſtead of ονομα. It would have ſaved him the trouble of referring to Dr. Clark, for the various ſenſes of *calling on the name* of Chriſt, when he does not allow of it *in any ſenſe at all:* But I would recommend this reſearch for a future edition; at which time alſo, it will be very proper to ſuggeſt ſome farther authorities to ſupport the, at preſent, ſtrained, diſtorted, and chimerical explication of Matt. xviii. 20, in which *I am* is made to ſignify, *it will be the ſame as if I were*, p. 133. Leſs learned and ingenious people have thought, that *I am in the midſt of them*, ſignifies the authority and ſuperintendance of Chriſt in his Church, who is *Head over all things to the Church*; as alſo his ſpiritual preſence, comfort and grace, who ſaid to his diſciples, *I will not leave you comfortleſs* or deſtitute, John xiv. 18; and upon his *perſonal* departure from the world, *Lo I am*, in a ſpi-

a ſpiritual ſenſe, *with you alway, even to the end of the world.* Matt. xxviii. 20.

But to be ſerious. "What muſt the common people think, when they obſerve men "of parts and learning, and that appear to "have ſome concern for religion, queſtioning "at every turn the authentickneſs of ſuch "a text, doubting that ſuch a paſſage is cor-"rupted, and expreſſing their fears, that in "this, and that, and a third place there is "either a mutilation or an addition?" *(b)* — It is indeed to produce ſcepticiſm, by rendering the ſcriptures uncertain; and I cannot but pity the cauſe that needs ſuch ſhifts. The author obſerves p. 130, on Rev. i. 5, 6, *Unto him that hath loved us, and waſhed us from our ſins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and prieſts unto God his Father; to him be glory and dominion, for ever, Amen,* "that this paſſage "is ſo *diſturbed*, that its meaning is very in-"concluſive," and for this he quotes Mill and Wetſtein.—Mine, (I muſt confeſs the ſmall copy of Wetſtein's Teſtament) mentions no variation of ſo much conſequence, as to diſturb the uſually received meaning of the paſſage; and if Dr. Clark has noticed *one* manuſcript with του αγαπησαντος και λουσαντος, Wetſtein gives the *Alexandrine* with αγαπωντι, (which ſupports our common reading) adding this *canon*, 'that

(b) Calamy on the Trinity, p. 161.

" that one volume ought not to authenticate
" a various reading, becauſe it proves nothing
" more then the negligence of the tranſcri-
" ber." (c) But even ſuppoſing Dr. Clark's to be the true reading, there is nothing got by it; for the chief ſtreſs of the doxology, lies upon the word αυτῶ, *to him* be glory &c. and I appeal to the diſcerning Reader, if it is not more natural to conſider that word as referring to Chriſt; and the whole as an aſcription of praiſe to Chriſt, who is the chief ſubject of theſe two verſes; rather than to the Father, who is only mentioned incidentally.—That ſuch aſcriptions are *ſcriptural*, the Author ſeems to grant on Rev. v. 13, *Bleſſing and honour &c. be to him that ſitteth on the throne, and to the Lamb for ever and ever*; only to enervate the force of it, he ſays, " that the
" Lamb was *ſeen* by John as by Stephen, Acts
" vii. 59," which we have proved makes no odds.—" That the Lamb is not ſaid to be *on*
" the throne, but *ſtanding in the midſt of it*," which amounts to the ſame.—" That it ſhould
" rather be read *before* the midſt of the
" throne," which I could never make out from εν μεσω του θρονου. — " That this honour
" was given to him on account of his being
" the *Lamb ſlain*," which nobody denies as one

(c) " Unus codex non facit variantem lectionem,
" quia arguit incuriam deſcriptoris." Can. ix.

one ground of it; the only queſtion being, whether it is due to him *as God* alſo?

But Mr. Lindſey not only ſtrives, to weaken or explain away, the texts that favour the oppoſite ſcheme to his, but labours hard to prove worſhip to Chriſt in the very nature of things *abſurd* and *unlawful*.—He tells us p. 120, "that "Chriſt himſelf prayed to his Father and his God," and ſo while on earth he did. It was his ſtate of humiliation, and in that ſtate *it behoved him to be made like unto* thoſe, whom he did the honour to call *his brethren. As the children were partakers of fleſh and blood, he alſo himſelf likewiſe took part of the ſame, and was in all points tempted as they are, yet without ſin*, that in the character of their High Prieſt he might be *touched with the feeling of the infirmities of others*, Heb. ii. iii. iv: As a part of his character therefore he prayed; without that he would not have been in *all things* like unto them; *(d)* yea there is a ſenſe in which he is even now praying to the Father; as the interceſſor

(d) It has been aſked, "If Chriſt is God and there "is only one God, to whom did Chriſt pray while on "earth? Did he pray to himſelf?"—And there would be ſome force in this objection, were it not ſtrenuouſly inſiſted, that the Chriſt was, in one reſpect, truly a man, notwithſtanding the incomprehenſible union between the human nature and the divine; and tho' we do not ſuppoſe the Godhead to conſiſt of *three ſepa-*

rate

ceſſor and advocate of his church; yet all this will not prove that there is not a higher reſpect to be paid to him than as Mediator. "But it is ſaid p. 121, that prayer to Chriſt "himſelf is prohibited in words as expreſs "as can be uſed;" and this preſumed prohibition is John xvi. 23, *In that day ye ſhall aſk me nothing; verily verily, whatſoever ye ſhall aſk the Father in my name, he will give it you*; the meaning of which let us endeavour to ſtate. —The Diſciples of Chriſt were very uninformed, and did not underſtand their Maſter's diſcourſes.—They came frequently to him therefore, to aſk him queſtions, for the explanation of his doctrine.—Our Lord perceiving *v.* 19, that they as uſual wiſhed to propoſe ſomething to him, tells them, that after his reſurrection, the Holy Spirit ſhould be poured out in full meaſure on them; and they ſhould be ſo ſupernaturally inſtructed, as not to have need of his perſonal preſence, in order to *propoſe difficult queſtions to him*, (εμε ουκ ερωτησετε ουδεν *me non interrogabitis quicqam*, Mont.): However that they might not, forward as ſome of them

---

rate Beings, (whatever that awful and myſterious diſtinction is whereby God appears to us as Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt,) there can be no abſurdity in ſaying, that our Lord prayed to God *as the Father*, ſince we do not mean by this expreſſion, that as *God the Son*, he prayed to God the Father; but as *the ſuffering Man Chriſt Jeſus*, and as our great exemplar and advocate.

them were, fancy that they would be independent of him or the Father; nor ſink on the other hand, into deſpondency at his departure from them; he directs them to an acceptable method of ſeeking the good things they wanted, aſſuring them of ſucceſs; — this was to pray to the Father, at the ſame time addreſſing him, the Son, and committing their petitions into his hands, who *preſents the prayers of all ſaints before the throne, with much incenſe.* Rev. viii. 3; an office which, we have ſeen, he could not be qualified for, if he were not poſſeſſed of omniſcience, and conſequently God. — The very expreſſion *in my name*, ſhews that there muſt be a practical regard to Chriſt, in all prayer that is acceptable; and if the chriſtians of the apoſtolic-age, did not conſider this text, as a prohibition of prayer to their Lord; but did *actually* pray to him: If Stephen prayed to him *to receive his ſpirit*, and Paul *committed his ſoul to him*, 2 Tim. i. 12, then nothing can be deduced from this paſſage, to the prejudice of the doctrine I am pleading for; divine worſhip to Chriſt.

"But this is to confound ideas, we are "informed p. 127, for if Chriſt is God to "whom prayer is to be offered, he cannot be "mediator to offer up theſe prayers." *Great is the myſtery of Godlineſs*, 1 Tim. iii. 16, nor would there be any wonder, if we were to

ſpeak obſcurely on ſubjects ſo much above our reach, as God and the heavenly world are. If the very happineſs of heaven, is different from any thing that has ever entered into the heart of man to conceive of, much more muſt God himſelf be unſearchable; yet, I think I could form an idea, in ſome meaſure clear and diſtinct, of a king, *as a legiſlator*, enacting a law with certain penalties, (a heavy fine ſuppoſe) annexed in caſe of diſobedience; and how this ſame king might, as *a private individual*, diſcharge this fine, in order at once to ſecure the honour of the law, and free certain penitent delinquents from the penalty of that law; and how theſe offenders might petition the king, *as a legiſlator*, to pardon their offence, on account of what he, *as a private perſon*, had done to procure their pardon; yea, and how theſe criminals might ſolicit the king *alone* and *privately*, that when, as the public Ruler of his people, he announced pardon to certain criminals, he would mention *them* alſo; and that in this their private petition, they might pay him, at one and the ſame time, the reſpect of ſovereign, and that of mediator to his laws and himſelf as the public magiſtrate, the guardian of the law. — In like manner, (with reverence be it ſpoken) I can ſee no inconſiſtency, in ſpeaking of the Moſt High, exiſting in the perſon of the *Father*, as the public Moral-Governor of the world; and

of the *Son*, as paying the penalty of the law, for the ſins of men; *(e)* and therefore no inconſiſtency, in praying to God as the *Father*, for pardon, on account of what he as the *Son*, did to procure this bleſſing; or in praying to him as the *Son*, to number us among thoſe, who will at laſt be publickly recognized, as the re-

(e) Among other enquiries, ariſing from the myſterious intricacy of the ſubject, or rather from the narrowneſs of our conceptions, this has been one, "How could "the Son of God make infinite ſatisfaction, ſeeing that "as God, he could not poſſibly ſuffer; and only the "human nature of Chriſt ſuffered?"—A proper anſwer to which is, "that by virtue of the union between "the human nature and the divine, the divine nature "ſtamped *dignity and value* on the ſufferings which the "human nature endured;" in ſome ſuch way *perhaps*, as our Lord himſelf hinted at, Matt. xxiii. 19, by the *altar ſanctifying*, i. e. *putting value* into *the gift* upon it; or as that benefit which the king does even in the way of a *private benefactor*, confers a farther honour, as a *royal donation*. The apoſtle Paul is generally underſtood, to refer to this value, which the divine nature of Chriſt put into the ſufferings of the human nature, in Heb. ix. 14, where Chriſt is ſpoken of as having, *through the Eternal Spirit*, offered himſelf, &c. The learned Mr. Pierce candidly remarks, on the preferableneſs of our preſent reading, *δια πνευματος αιωνιου*; and that "the nature of the Author's argument ſeems "to lead us to conſider this Spirit as ſignifying the "λογος, *or divine nature of our Lord*, ſince he is ſetting "forth *the intrinſic worth and excellency of his offering*;" accordingly he inſerts *in his paraphraſe*, the *Eternal* Spirit.

deemed of the Lord; eſpecially, as our Lord Jeſus Chriſt is, in his *human nature* alſo, repreſented as being in heaven and making interceſſion; tho' the *manner* of doing it even the Author acknowledges that he cannot explain it. Ap. p. 126.—As to plain Chriſtians, p. 217, they are in general contented with praying to the Father, by means of the Son, thro' the influence and grace of the Holy Spirit, and honouring each as God, and as bearing diſtinct offices in the work of ſalvation; without entering into nice and ſubtile diſquiſitions "how this can be?" *(f)* and there is little danger of their being bewildered, unleſs their teachers puzzle them by too critical enquiries

---

(f) By this means too Mr. Lindſey's ſtumbling block, which he profeſſes he *knows not how to get over, (Sermon at Eſſex Houſe, p. 23, Note)* is very eaſily removed; and each of the *divine perſons* have proper and ſupreme worſhip. —Plain Chriſtians are not ſo quick-ſighted to theſe difficulties.—As to the omiſſion of this doctrine in the *Lord's prayer*, as it is called; not to mention that we do not read any where in ſcripture, of the diſciples keeping cloſe in their devotions to the *letter* of this prayer; the untruth of the doctrine is no more to be argued from its not being particularly deſcribed here, than that of other important matters (ſuch as the *death, reſurrection* and *mediation of Chriſt)* in which alſo the diſciples were very dark, until the *deſcent of the Spirit* upon them; but our Lord *did* ſuggeſt the worſhip due to the Son and Spirit in the *baptiſmal form*, and the conduct of the apoſtles afterwards is a practical expoſition of the ſenſe in which they underſtood it.

enquiries into the *modus* of ſubjects confeſſedly inexplicable.—"But it is eaſy on ſuch a ſubject "to *darken* counſel by words without know- "ledge, and in talking of the infinite nature "of God to loſe and confound ourſelves, and "to think we argue very ſubtily, whilſt we "only diſcover our own raſhneſs and igno- "rance. It is the eaſieſt thing in the world, "when talking of things ſo remote from our "apprehenſions, to raiſe difficulties; and if I "were diſpoſed or could allow myſelf to take "raſh liberties on ſuch awful ſubjects, *I could* "*produce things with regard to the eternity of* "*God, his immenſity, and other unqueſtionable* "*attributes of the divine nature, which would* "*carry as great an appearance of contradiction,* "*as what this Writer offers concerning the bleſſed* "*Trinity.* I own it is a *myſtery*, and if we "muſt have a religion without myſteries, we "muſt caſt off natural religion itſelf, and "have recourſe to downright atheiſm, which "yet involves the moſt unintelligible myſte- "ries of all." *Leland's Anſwer to Tindal, Vol. II. p.* 450.

I have thus endeavoured to follow the Rev. Apologiſt, thro' the *argumentative* part of his performance; and I hope have made it appear, that there are in the Bible clear evidences of worſhip to the Son and Spirit of God; and if ſo, the Common-Prayer Book will not be altered for the better, by expung-

ing

ing theſe articles out of it.—The Author ſays, p. 144, "that the Holy Ghoſt is not in ſcrip-"ture *called God*."—I cannot make any other ſenſe of 2 Cor. v. 5, *He that hath wrought you for this ſelf ſame thing*, i. e. heaven, *is God*, for this is the peculiar office of the Holy Spirit; nor of Acts v. 4, where *lying to the Holy Ghoſt*, is ſaid to be lying *not to men but to God*, (*g*) nor underſtand otherwiſe, how blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt, ſhould be deemed, ſo much more aggravated a crime, than that againſt the Son, that it was pronounced *altogether unpardonable*, Matt. xii. 31. (*h*)—As the *ſpirit of a man* is not a Being different from the

(*g*) "Ananias did in ſuch a ſenſe lie to the Holy "Ghoſt, as that when he did ſo he might be ſaid to lie "unto God. Now there are but two ſenſes that I know "of in which he could poſſibly do this; either to him "[the Spirit] *as truly and properly God*, or elſe to him, "*as acting by divine authority*, and ſo *in effect* to God. "But he did not lie to the Holy Spirit merely as acting "by divine authority; for had he done ſo, he might "be ſaid *to have lied unto Peter*, he alſo acting by di-"vine authority; yet this he is declared not to have "done, for *he did not lie unto men*, (i. e. the *ſin* was not "againſt men.) Wherefore it follows, that the Holy "Spirit to whom he thus lied, is truly and properly "God." *Reply to a Letter to Mr. C. Evans*, *p.* 38—39.

(*h*) "We are not, ſays Mr. Emlyn, (Apology, p. "144) called the *ſervants or people* of the *Holy Ghoſt*;" but he ſhould have remembered, that the *thing* is plainly implied in many places, ſuch as Acts xvi. 6, by being *forbidden*

the *man himſelf*, ſo the *Spirit of God* is no other than *God*. 1 Cor. ii. 10, 11. — But I have done. ——

Reader! Beware of treating this diſpute negligently, as a matter of ſimple ſpeculation. — It is a doctrine that muſt needs enter into the very nature of practical religion. — Search the ſcriptures; pray for divine illumination; and judge which is the *ſcripture-doctrine*, that of the Apology or its humble Replier. — If divine titles, honours and worſhip are given to the Son and Spirit, — if prayer is made to them; then do they partake of Deity; they are, with the Father, the *one God bleſſed for ever*; and the "whole chriſtian church in the "apoſtolic age, made up of Jews and Gen-"tiles, *tho' called Nazarenes*, were not Unitarians," p. 161; but that this doctrine ſhould in our days raiſe an objection againſt Chriſtianity, in the minds of unbelieving Jews and of Heathens, is no more to be wondered at, than that the ſame goſpel was of old, *to the Jews a ſtumbling-block, and to the Greeks fooliſhneſs*. 1 Cor. i. 23. Nay it has no worſe treatment

---

forbidden of the Holy Ghoſt; and Acts xx. 28, by being *made overſeers of the church by the Holy Ghoſt*; and 1 Cor. vi. 19, by *being the temples of the Holy Ghoſt*, i. e. temples *conſecrated to* the Holy Ghoſt; expreſſions which, if they do not carry in them the idea of *accountableneſs* and *devotedneſs* to the Holy Ghoſt, I cannot reduce to any rational meaning.

ment from *them*, than is *practically* given to it by moſt men in thoſe countries that are called Chriſtian.—We are not, in order to gain converts, to bring chriſtianity to the depraved ſtandard of Jews, Mahometans and Pagans.—That would be making that crooked, which God has made ſtrait. — It rather becomes us to pray that God may *ſhine into their hearts, to give them the knowledge of the glory of God, in the face of Jeſus Chriſt.* 2 Cor. iv. 6. And that their minds may be ſubdued to a humble *obedience to the faith.* Rom. i. 5. Even ſo, Lord Jeſus come quickly!

I am no farther concerned in the diſpute between the Rev. Author and his ſuperiors in the church, than my earneſt prayers, that both ſides may be directed to that, which is for the honour of God; and that affairs may be diſpoſed ſo, as to promote what is much wanted, *a thorough reformation in Religion and Manners.* Amen!

5 0059

FINIS.